

**SPAWAR Systems Center – Pacific**

David Roden, Code 22710  
53560 Hull Street  
San Diego, CA 92152-5001

**TO:** \_\_\_\_\_**AGENCY:** \_\_\_\_\_**PHONE:** \_\_\_\_\_**EMAIL:** \_\_\_\_\_**INFORMATION REQUEST  
PAST PERFORMANCE**

This office is currently in the process of awarding a competitive service contract. [\[CONTRACTOR NAME\]](#) has provided your name and organization as a reference regarding [\[CONTRACTOR'S NAME\]](#) record of past performance under Contract No. [\[CONTRACT NO.\]](#). Specifically, we are looking for past performance information regarding the following areas:

(a) Quality of Product or Service - Conformance to contract requirements, specifications and standards of good workmanship, accuracy of reports, appropriateness of personnel, and technical excellence.

(b) Cost Control - Within budget, current accurate and complete billings, actual cost/rates reflect closely to negotiated cost/rates, cost efficiency measures, adequate budgetary internal controls.

(c) Schedule - Timeliness of performance, met interim milestones, reliable, responsive to technical and contractual direction, completed on time, including wrap-up and contract administration, no liquidated damages assessed.

(d) Business Relationships - Effective management, businesslike correspondence, responsive to contract requirements, prompt notification of problems, reasonable/cooperative behavior, flexible, proactive, effective Contractor recommended solutions, customer satisfaction.

(e) Compliance with FAR 52.219-8 "Utilization of Small Business Concerns," - Effective program to maximize the participation of small business concerns in Federal agency contracts, and provide timely payment to such concerns, per FAR 52.219-8.

(f) Key Personnel - How long key personnel stayed on the contract, how well they managed their portion of the contract, whether contractor proposed substitute personnel to fulfill requirements that were unqualified, the quality and relevancy of the products/services generated by key personnel.

In order for our team to compile its evaluation, we request that you complete the attached survey form and email or fax it, and any other pertinent information, by **8 December 2016** to David Roden at e-mail [david.rodan@navy.mil](mailto:david.rodan@navy.mil) or fax (619) 553-0928. Any relevant information you have would be vital in our assessment of the aforementioned Contractor.

Respectfully,

Cindy Ledesma  
Contracting Officer

**CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SURVEY**

CONTRACTOR NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

CONTRACT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATION PERIOD: \_\_\_\_\_

TASK ORDER NO.: \_\_\_\_\_

GOVERNMENT TECHNICAL REPRESENTATIVE:

---

Name (print)	Organization / Code	Phone
--------------	---------------------	-------

**RATING DEFINITIONS**

Unsatisfactory	Entirely unfavorable past performance. Offeror has consistently not satisfied previous customers and/or violated laws, regulations, and contract requirements. Performance did not meet contractual requirements and any corrective action taken was not effective.
Marginal	Record of performance split between favorable & unfavorable. Performance did not meet some of the contractual requirements. The element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor did not implement or has not implemented satisfactory corrective actions.
Satisfactory	Record of performance favorable. Offeror has satisfied previous customers, laws, regulations, and contract requirements.
Very Good	Record of performance very favorable. Offeror has satisfied previous customers, laws, regulations, and contract requirements and exceeded some of the contract requirements to the government's benefit.
Exceptional	Record of performance extremely favorable. Offeror has always satisfied previous customers, laws, regulations, and contract requirements to a high degree and exceeded many contractual requirements to the government's benefit.

Please read the statements on the following page(s), indicating your relative level of agreement in the box provided keeping in mind the definitions above:

EXCEPTIONALVERY  
GOODSATISFACTORYMARGINALUNSATa.) QUALITY OF PRODUCT OR SERVICE:

- (1) The Contractor provided a product or service that conformed to contract requirements, specifications, and standards of good workmanship
- (2) The Contractor submitted accurate reports.
- (3) The Contractor utilized personnel that were appropriate to the effort performed.


b.) COST CONTROL:

- (1) The Contractor performed the effort within the estimated cost/price.
- (2) The Contractor submitted accurate invoices on a timely basis.
- (3) The Contractor demonstrated cost efficiencies in performing the required effort.
- (4) The actual costs/rates realized closely reflected the negotiated costs/rates.


c.) SCHEDULE:

- (1) The tasks required under this effort were performed in a timely manner and in accordance with the period of performance of the contract.
- (2) The Contractor was responsive to technical and/or contractual direction.


d.) BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS:

- (1) The Contractor demonstrated effective management over the effort performed.
- (2) The Contractor maintained an open line of communication so that the COR and/or Technical Point of Contact were apprised of technical, cost, and schedule issues.
- (3) The Contractor presented information and correspondence in a clear, concise, and businesslike manner.
- (4) The Contractor promptly notified the Contracting Officer's Representative, Technical Point of Contact, and/or Contracting Officer in a timely manner regarding urgent issues.
- (5) The Contractor cooperated with the Government in providing flexible, proactive, and effective recommended solutions to critical program issues.
- (6) The products/services provided adequately met the needs of the program.
- (7) I am satisfied with the performance of the Contractor under this effort.


e.) COMPLIANCE WITH FAR 52.219-8:

- (1) The Contractor demonstrated an effective program to maximize the participation of small business concerns (FAR 52.219-8).

--	--	--	--	--

f.) KEY PERSONNEL:

- (1) The labor turnover in key personnel labor categories was minimal and did not adversely affect Contractor performance.
- (2) The Contractor did not frequently propose personnel to fulfill the requirements of the contract that were clearly unqualified.
- (3) The key personnel effectively managed their portion of contract.


**NOTE: Please provide a brief explanation for the ratings in each area on the attached page, especially in instances where the rating is a Marginal or Unsatisfactory.**

CONTRACT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

[illegible]